

"Majdanek-Prozess" in Düsseldorf

Robert Faurisson

* * * * *

May 1978

To the German court, about the so-called "gas chambers" that visitors may see today in Majdanek (near Lublin)

Résumé : If a *German* court has no *German* expert's report about the so-called "gas chambers" in Majdanek, no *German* judge can say that, 35 years ago, there were *German* "gas chambers" in Majdanek and that groups of human beings have been destroyed by this way for the first and the last time in history. For such an extraordinary **crime** (at a scientific and historical point of view) and for such an extraordinary **arm** [weapon] (that no German judge has ever seen working), we really need that the **arm** of the **crime** gets an **expert's report**. The **arm** of this **crime** even needs an **expert's report** of an **exceptional quality** (at a scientific and historical point of view because no German judge has ever seen such an arm working).

Details : If a German court was willing to proceed to a "judicial visit of the place" (*un "transport de justice sur les lieux"*), to examine the so-called "gas chambers", it would be a good beginning. In this case, no German judge, after the visit, could say : "We have seen gas chambers." A judge could only say : "We have seen some premises called « gas chambers »." Yet, even this is not correct. To be quite correct, he should say : "We have seen some premises which were referred to as *former* « gas chambers »."

The judge would have to consider that this was asserted by a "court of inquiry" composed only by people who were at war with Germany (Doc. Nurnberg 325-PS : 25.09.1944/237g). This commission was in fact composed of Polish and Soviet magistrates. It would be indispensable to procure the conclusions this commission came to, and **all** the documents it relied upon.

No German judge has ever seen, I suppose, a "gas chamber" (expressly made to destroy *groups* of human beings), either working or disused. To a German judge, a "gas chamber" may be something as a "flying saucer". Let us now suppose that a man says to a judge : "Come and I'll show you a « flying saucer »." The judge would come. At the bottom of a sort of bunker he would notice a pitiful scrap-heap I bet that the judge would not, after that, go and say : "I have seen a « flying saucer »." He would ask for an **expert's report**. For the Majdanek "gas chambers", an **expert's report** must be made by archaeologists, chemists, physicists, architects, physicians, historians, documentalists, and specialists of engineering. To conclude, the inquiry should be conducted with the same rigour as for Katyn. We might even say more scientifically than for Katyn, as the alleged massacres in the so-called "gas chambers" were the result of a more sophisticated process.

As no **expert's report** is forthcoming, no German judge can come to the conclusion that there were "gas chambers" in Majdanek.

Herewith : 18 photos. "Visit in 1946", "Visit in 1975" : completely changed.

May 1978

First display on aaargh: April 2, 2001

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <[\[email protected\]](#)>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA..

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in thoses places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

